

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE 9D

ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH  
13 APRIL 1980

# New CIA Pressure For Secrecy

By Richard Dudman  
Post-Dispatch Washington Bureau Chief

WASHINGTON — Adm. Stansfield Turner, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, told newspaper editors last week that the Soviet ambassador, under an American law, can ask for information from CIA files and get a response within 10 days.

What Turner did not say was that the CIA does not have to give the Soviet ambassador, or anyone else, any information that has been properly given a secrecy classification or any information that would disclose sources and methods of intelligence collection. Nor did he say that, in practice, virtually no one has received information from the CIA in 10 days.

Turner's remark, possibly intended to shock the visiting editors, was part of a campaign by the CIA and some members of Congress to exempt most of the agency's files from provisions of the Freedom of Information Act.

Other efforts are under way to grant blanket exemptions for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Federal Trade Commission.

The Freedom of Information Act was enacted in 1966 and strengthened in 1974, at the height of the Watergate scandal. It was intended to establish a framework for giving citizens access to government files. It never has been popular with government agencies, although they generally have responded to requests in good faith, while making full use of the broad exemption provisions.

Among the public disclosures that have resulted from requests under the act are the CIA's spying on the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, the agency's wiretapping and mail-opening programs, aspects of its Bay of Pigs fiasco, the agency's infiltration of lawful political groups in the United States, its secret behavior-control and drug-testing programs, and its attempts to keep the Glomar Explorer incident out of the press.

Now the pendulum has swung away from reform toward a new emphasis on national security. The drive to dismember the act has gained strength from the humiliation of the U.S. defeat in Vietnam and other more recent foreign policy setbacks.

Turner, in his appearance before the editors, said the agency was seeking only "limited relief" from the Freedom of Information Act. His main point was that foreign intelligence agencies and prospective U.S. undercover agents abroad see the act as a security threat.

"How do you persuade someone to risk his life for our country if he fears that I may be required by law to reveal his name in public?" Turner asked.

He did not dispute the fact that the working of the act never has forced the CIA to make public any information that was classified or that would disclose intelligence sources or methods.

Last year, a make public the document, but Another adverse force the release sources and met

Turner, rather, says the problem minds of foreign

Surprisingly, had on unspecified security secret because of adm.

"There is a perception on the part of some sources that we may not be able to hold the line under the Freedom of Information Act," he said. "So far, we have not lost a case. But if you are going to put your neck on the line, do you want to bank on courts with unpredictable judges and court procedures? Of course not."

A strong supporter of the Freedom of Information Act, the privately financed Center for National Security Studies, sees no reason to doubt the CIA contention that some friendly intelligence services and sources are leery about cooperating with the CIA because so much information has been made public about the agency in the last few years — in some cases without the CIA's consent.

But, says the center in a report last week, the act is not the leading cause of the problem. Other sources of public information about the CIA, the report says, include leaks by intelligence and other officials, damage actions against the CIA or individual officials, memoirs written by former CIA officials, and possible disclosures of information provided to the Senate and House Oversight Committees, although neither house has yet taken such action.

The report said the CIA had hurt its reputation for protecting its agents by several recent instances in which it has pulled out of relationships and left agents exposed.

For example, in the U.S. exodus from Vietnam in 1975, the CIA not only failed to take along the Vietnamese who had cooperated with the agency under a promise of protection, but it also left behind records identifying them to Hanoi as CIA collaborators, according to the report. It quoted former CIA agent Frank Snepp's book, "Decent Interval," as a source.

The center's report told how the Freedom of

CONTINUED